

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the amended application is requested.

Claims Status

Claims 1 to 41 are cancelled. Claims 42 to 69 were pending. Claims 47 and 51 are currently canceled. No claims have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 42 and 53 are currently amended.

New claim 70 is added. Antecedent basis is found at paragraph [0052], 2nd sentence.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 42, 46, 47, 51 to 55, and 65 to 69 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Appln. Publn. No. 2002/0179237 (Inagaki et al.).

Claim 42 is amended to recite that the substrate is selected from paper, card stock, and cardboard. It is also amended to recite that the securing mechanism is adjacent an edge of the substrate.

Inagaki et al. discloses substrates made of plastic laminates, not paper, card stock, or cardboard. In addition, Inagaki et al. does not teach that the features asserted to be analogous to Applicant's securing mechanism are located adjacent an edge of the substrate; instead, they are located in the interior of the sheet, see Figs. 7 and 9.

Furthermore, Inagaki et al. does not disclose that its substrate is writeable.

Claims 53, 68, and 69 are directed to a stack of the cards of the invention, arranged top to bottom. Inagaki et al. does not disclose a stack of the sheets disclosed therein. The ability to stack, shuffle, and otherwise manipulate cards of the invention is a significant aspect of the invention. There is nothing in Inagaki et al. suggesting such use and the advantages thereof, accordingly, the reference does not anticipate such use or the structures described in claims 53, 68, and 69.

For these reasons Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are novel over Inagaki et al. and respectfully request that the rejection under 35 USC § 102(b) be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 43 to 45 and 48 to 50 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,517,106 (Chase).

Secondary reference discloses a system whereby a portion of an adhesive layer is exposed by removal of a release liner while an article is positioned on a surface, then the remaining portion is exposed to finish adhesion of the article to the surface. Because of this divergent use, one skilled in the art would not make the proposed combination of the permanent mounting of Chase with the reopenable action of Inagaki et al.

In view of this fundamental differences in purpose, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 43 to 45 and 48 to 50 are unobvious over the proposed combination of references.

Claims 56 to 60 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,924,227 (Sommers).

Deficiencies of Inagaki et al. are discussed above. Secondary reference Sommers does not disclose adhesive members, accordingly it cannot cure these deficiencies.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 56 to 60 be withdrawn.

Claim 61 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,824,415 (Kanki et al.).

Deficiencies of Inagaki et al. are discussed above. Secondary reference Kanki et al. does cure these deficiencies.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 61 be withdrawn.

Claims 62 to 64 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,141,790 (Calhoun).

Deficiencies of Inagaki et al. are discussed above. Secondary reference Calhoun does cure these deficiencies, it does not disclose index cards, it does not disclose formation of a securing mechanism at an edge of the sheet. One of ordinary skill in the art would not find the necessary suggestion or motivation in Calhoun to make the changes to Inagaki et al.'s sheets necessary to yield the present invention.

Claims 42 to 44, 48, 49, 68, and 69 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase in view of Inagaki et al.

Index cards of the invention are capable of being releasably secured to mounting substrates. Chase discloses an article and method of adhesion whereby a portion of an adhesive layer is exposed by removal of a release liner prior and then upon final positioning, the remaining release liner is removed so as to permit adhesive.

Claims 68 and 69 are directed to embodiments where cards of the invention are stacked without adhering to one another, and in the case of claim 69 shuffled without adhering to one another. Neither Chase nor Inagaki et al. discloses arrangement in stacks, thus the proposed combination cannot render claims 68 and 69 obvious.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) over Chase in view of Inagaki et al. is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

12 October 2010
Date

By: /Robert H. Jordan/
Robert H. Jordan, Reg. No.: 31,973
Telephone No.: 651-733-6866

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833